



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,115	07/24/2003	H. William Harris JR.	2213.1004-012	9402	
21005	7590 12/17/2004		EXAMINER		
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			ABBOTT, YVONNE RENEE		
530 VIRGINI P.O. BOX 913	· · · · · ·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			3644		
			DATE MAILED: 12/17/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					A			
		Ar	plication No.	Applicant(s)	100			
		10	0/626,115	HARRIS ET AL.	1			
0	ffice Action Summary	Ex	aminer	Art Unit				
			onne R. Abbott	3644				
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appears	s on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence add	iress			
THE MAILI - Extensions or after SIX (6) - If the period f - If NO period f - Failure to rep Any reply rec	NED STATUTORY PERIOD F NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN f time may be available under the provisions MONTHS from the mailing date of this coming for reply specified above is less than thirty (if for reply is specified above, the maximum soly within the set or extended period for reply eived by the Office later than three monthsoluter adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). nunication. 30) days, a reply with tatutory period will ap y will, by statute, caus	In no event, however, may a in the statutory minimum of thi ply and will expire SIX (6) MOse the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this con BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠ Resp	onsive to communication(s) file	ed on 24 July 2	003.					
· ·			ion is non-final.					
3) Since	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of	Claims							
4a) O 5) ☐ Claim 6) ☑ Claim 7) ☑ Claim	n(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the fine above claim(s) is/an(s) is/an(s) is/are allowed. n(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. n(s) <u>2</u> is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restricted.	ire withdrawn f						
Application Pa	ipers							
10)⊠ The d Applic Repla	pecification is objected to by the rawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 cant may not request that any objected to cement drawing sheet(s) including the or declaration is objected to	is/are: a) action to the draw	ving(s) be held in abeya s required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). I(s) is objected to. See 37 CFI	• •			
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	owledgment is made of a claim b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation attached detailed Office action	documents ha documents ha of the priority o nal Bureau (Po	ve been received. ve been received in A locuments have beer CT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National S	Stage			
2) 🔲 Notice of Dra	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-	-152)			
	Mail Date <u>11/17/04</u> .		6) 🔲 Other:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•			

Application/Control Number: 10/626,115

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hjaltason et al. (6,789,502). Hjaltason et al. disclose an aquatic food composition comprising at least 0.5 wt% sodium chloride (col. 6, lines 6-14). Although Hialtason does not specifically discloses that the weight percentage of NaCl in the composition is between 1-10%, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in order to provide the optimal aquaculture environment for a particular species. Since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages. See In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980) ("[D]iscovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art." See, e.q., In re Baird, 16 F.3d 380, 29 USPQ2d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1994); <u>In re Jones</u>, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). *In*

Application/Control Number: 10/626,115 Page 3

Art Unit: 3644

re Peterson Appeal No. 02-1189 (Fed. Cir. January 8, 2003). Where routing testing and general experimental conditions are present, discovering the optimum or workable ranges until the desired effect is achieved involves only routing skill in the art.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seawright (6,065,245). Seawright discloses an aquaculture diet composition comprising sodium chloride (Tables 16.3, 1634,17.1), however, the claimed weight percentages aren't specifically disclosed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the claimed weight percentage of NaCl in the Seawright composition in order to provide the optimal concentration of nutrient requirements of the aquaculture; additionally, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne R. Abbott whose telephone number is (703)308-2866. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on (703)305-7421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yvonne R. Abbott Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3644

12/9/04